	CTA	TEC	DICTD.	\mathbf{T}	COI	тот
UNITED	SIA	$\Gamma \Gamma \mathcal{O}$	DISTR	11.71	してい	JKI

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

FELTON A. SPEARS, JR. and SIDNEY SCHOLL, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FIRST AMERICAN EAPPRAISEIT (a/k/a eAppraiseIT, LLC), a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No. 5-08-CV-00868-RMW

ORDER RE: LETTER FROM JENNY **MERRIS RE: SEALING**

[Re Docket No. 451]

Following the court's order on sealing, Dkt. No. 444, non-party JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., filed a letter with the court providing further specific information that two exhibits (Exhibit 12 Declaration of Brian C. Berggren in Support of Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Bifurcation, Dkt. No. 406-7; Exhibit 50 of the Declaration of Justin N. Owens in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion for Class Decertification, Dkt. No. 390-19) contain confidential information related to individual appraisals (such as third-party borrowers' names, addresses, etc.). Chase suggests that redacting the odd-numbered pages of the two exhibits will be sufficient to redact this information. Accordingly, the court requests that submitting party EAppraiseIT refile the two exhibits with the odd-numbered pages redacted within 7 days. See Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(3).

ORDER Case No. 8-CV-00868-RMW

Case 5:08-cv-00868-RMW Document 457 Filed 10/02/14 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

In the future, all sealing motions and declarations must comply with Civil Local Rule
79-5, which requires <u>narrowly tailored sealing requests</u> . The parties must specifically identify
confidential information that is sealable in their motions, not after the court has reviewed the
sealing motions multiple times.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 2, 2014



ORDER Case No. 8-CV-00868-RMW